

REMARKS

Claims 15, 16, 18-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 15, 20, 22 and 25 are amended. Claim 17 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter of that claim. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner, in an Examiner initiated interview on July 3, 2007, provided suggested amended claim language which the Examiner indicated would place the application in immediate condition for allowance. Applicant appreciates this effort and bases the above amendments on this indication. Specifically, the subject matter of the Examiner's proposed amendment is incorporated into independent claims 15, 20, 22 and 25. Therefore, this application is in condition for allowance.

The Office Action states that claim 19 recites allowable subject matter. Applicant appreciates this indication of allowability. The Office Action, on page 2, objects to claim 25 for informalities. Claim 25 is amended, as suggested, in order to obviate this objection.

The Office Action rejects claims 15-18 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,843,542 to Brushafer et al. (hereinafter "Brushafer"). The Office Action rejects claims 15-17 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,180,409 to Fisher. Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 15-18 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,076,627 to Friedrichs. Applicant respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action and the Examiner agree that none of Brushafer, Fisher or Friedrichs teach, nor would they have suggested, a single layer filter cloth comprising multi-filament warp yarns and multi-filament weft yarns, and thicker monofilament yarns woven onto the surface of the filter cloth forming flow channels for filtrate flow, wherein the thicker

monofilament yarns are spaced apart, parallel to and against the weft yarns, as positively recited in the pending claims.

For at least the above reasons, none of Brushafer, Fisher or Friedrichs teach, nor would they have suggested, the combination of features as positively recited at least in independent claims 15, 20, 22 and 25. Claims 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26 and 27 are also allowable at least for their dependence on the allowable independent claims, as well as for these separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections as enumerated in the Office Action above are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 15, 16, and 18-27 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkheimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:KDB/sxl

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: November 27, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461